

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 24 2005

Attorney's Docket No.: 15786-005002

**OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION FACSIMILE:****OFFICIAL FAX NO: (571) 273-8300**

Number of pages including this page 4

Applicant : Clauss et al.  
Serial No. : 10/081,446  
Filed : February 20, 2002

Art Unit : 2113  
Examiner : Scott T. Baderman

Title : Error Handling and Representation in a Computer-Aided Design Environment

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF – PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attached to this facsimile communication cover sheet is REPLY BRIEF TO  
EXAMINER'S ANSWER MAILED AUGUST 23, 2005, faxed this 24th day of October, 2005,  
to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brenda M. Leeds Binder  
Reg. No. 57,520

Date: October 24, 2005

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
Redwood City, California 94063  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Fax: (650) 839-5071

50308297.doc

NOTE: This facsimile is intended for the addressee only and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately call us collect at (650) 839-5070 to arrange for its return. Thank you.

Attorney's Docket No.: 15786-005002

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE****OCT 24 2005**

Applicant : Clauss et al. Art Unit : 2113  
 Serial No. : 10/081,446 Examiner : Scott T. Baderman  
 Filed : February 20, 2002  
 Title : ERROR HANDLING AND REPRESENTATION IN A COMPUTER-AIDED  
           DESIGN ENVIRONMENT

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**  
 Commissioner for Patents  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY BRIEF TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER MAILED AUGUST 23, 2005**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41, Applicant responds to the Examiner's Answer at page 7, para. 3 to page 9, para. 2 as follows. The Examiner asserts that Burrows (US Patent 6,397,117) discloses the first three limitations of claim 16, and relies on Ben Natan (US Patent 5,740,354) as disclosing the fourth limitation. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Ben Natan discloses "providing information to a user to facilitate the user in determining a location of a cause of the failure within the CAD design and information about how to recover from the failure."

Ben Natan relates to errors in a computer system, but has no disclosure about errors in the context of a CAD software application, which is not disputed by the Examiner. However, the Examiner asserts that Ben Natan teaches that it is beneficial to supply error messages that are meaningful to a user so that they will be useful in understanding and aid the user to remediate the error, which the Examiner also asserts is motivation to combine Burrows and Ben Natan.

The applicant respectfully disagrees that Burrows in combination with Ben Natan discloses the fourth limitation of claim 16. Although Ben Natan may disclose providing error messages that are meaningful to a user, the examples of such meaningful messages do not disclose messages that meet the fourth limitation of claim 16. Ben Natan gives examples of meaningful error messages such as indicating to a user that a file could be printed because a

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION BY FACSIMILE**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date indicated below.

---

October 24, 2005

Date of Transmission

Signature

Sarah E. Hoke

Type or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

Applicant : Clauss et al.  
Serial No. : 10/081,446  
Filed : February 20, 2002  
Page : 2

Attorney's Docket No. 15786-005002

named file has become corrupted, or a file could not be printed because a named file does not exist (Col. 1, lines 45-55). Although such a message may be more meaningful to a user than a simple "could not print" message, the message still does not provide "information about how to recover from the failure". That is, how is the user to uncorrupt the file? Or, how what is the user to do about a file that does not exist? The applicant therefore maintains that the error message content disclosed by Ben Natan does not include the content required by claim 16; there is no information provided about how to recover from the failure.

Further, claim 16 also requires providing information to a user to facilitate the user in determining a location of a cause of the failure within the CAD design. An example discussed in the specification is "modeling error: shell too thick" (Specification, p. 13, line 11), clearly indicating the location of the cause of the failure within the CAD design as being the shell element. Ben Natan does not disclose providing information to facilitate determining a location of a cause of a failure within a CAD design, as Ben Natan has nothing to do with CAD software applications. An example of an error message in Ben Natan indicates that a certain file is corrupted and therefore could not print; there is no indication of a location – within said file – of the cause of the failure. Thus, even in the context of the error messages described in Ben Natan there is no inclusion of information to facilitate a user in determining a location of a cause of a failure. Therefore, even if modifying Burrows with what is disclosed in Ben Natan, the error messages mentioned in Burrows would not be modified to include information to facilitate user in determining a location of a cause of a failure, let alone the location of a cause of a failure within the CAD design.

Thus, even if combining Burrows with Ben Natan, at most the "error messages" referred to in Burrows (of which there is no disclosure of what said error messages may relate to or what information, if any, may be included therein), may include information "meaningful to a user so that they will be useful in understanding and aid the user to remediate the error" as asserted by the Examiner. But even so, there is no disclosure in either Burrows, Ben Natan, or the references combined, of providing information to facilitate determining a location of a cause of a failure within a CAD design, nor information about how to recover from the failure. Accordingly, even in combination, the fourth limitation of claim 16 is not disclosed.

Applicant : Clauss et al.  
Serial No. : 10/081,446  
Filed : February 20, 2002  
Page : 3

Attorney's Docket No. 15786-005002

For these reasons, and the reasons stated in the Appeal Brief, Applicant submits that the final rejection should be reversed.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct 24/05



Brenda M. Leeds Binder  
Reg. No. 57,520

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
Redwood City, California 94063  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50307956.doc